

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

12 This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Seal (#36), filed October 16, 2013.
13
14 At the time of filing the motion, Plaintiff also filed several affidavits allegedly supportive of his
15 claims in this matter. (#37). Plaintiff seeks to have the affidavits filed under seal. He also seeks a
16 court order sealing all future affidavits. Plaintiff has not cited any authority supporting his request
17 that documents be sealed. Generally, “[t]he failure of a moving party to file points and authorities in
18 support of the motion shall constitute a consent to the denial of the motion.” *See Local Rule 7-2(d).*
19 The decision to seal documents in a case is not one taken lightly and is subject to exacting standards.
20 *See e.g. Kamakan v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006). Additionally, it is
21 not clear why the affidavits have been filed in the first instance, as they are not specifically
22 connected to any particular motion or request for relief. They appear to simply be evidence Plaintiff
23 intends to use to potentially support his claim. As such, they are best viewed, in the manner
24 submitted, as discovery materials which should not be filed with the Court. *See Local Rule 26-8.*
Consequently, the Court will strike the affidavits. Accordingly,

25 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Seal (#36) is **denied without**
26 **prejudice.**

1 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk shall strike Plaintiff's filing at docket entry
2 #37.

Dated: October 22, 2013.

C.W. Hoffman, Jr.
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE